

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2014

In Attendance:

DISTRICTS -

Adair – Anita Goode	Elizabethtown –	Monroe – Jamie Stanford
Allen –	Glasgow –	Ohio – Christy Nofsinger
Barren -	Grayson –	Owensboro - Kim Johnson
Bowling Green – Vicki Writsel	Green – Dr. Rhonda Simpson	Russell –
Breckinridge –	Hancock – Aleta Sisk	Russellville –
Butler – Sarah Ingram	Hardin – Kim Adkins	Simpson –
Campbellsville – Joni Davis	Hardin – Rhonda Lockwood	Taylor –
Caverna – Susan Mathews	Hart – Donna LeFevre	Todd – Kim Justice
Clinton – Eddie Tallent	LaRue –	Warren – Michelle Blick
Cloverport – Sara Greathouse	Logan –	West Point – Karen Brigdon
Cumberland –	McLean – Sherri Turley	
Daviess – Robin Bush	Meade – Mark Martin	
Edmonson –	Metcalf –	

PARTNERS –

Campbellsville University –	KSB – Wendy Strode-Ross	KSD – Laurie VanConia
Campbellsville University –	KDE –	RTC – Bill Porter
KAES – Alex Fitzpatrick	KSD - Meena Mann	WKU – Christina Noel

GRREC SP ED STAFF:

Michelle Antle	Barb DeGraaf	Sheila Thompson
Rendy Belcher	Rebecca Gaddie	Amanda Turner
Pat Butler	Pat Kelley	Katrinka Wagoner
Beth Carter	Lisa Loague	Randi Womack
Jennifer Clemmons	Kathy Maciel	
Dr. Kelly Davis	Debra Myers	

GUESTS:

Shannon Stafford, Interpreter	Regina Guthrie, Russellville Ind.
Julie Buckham, Interpreter	Kris Belcher, Henderson Co.
Allison Chandler, KSB	Stacia Wolf, Henderson Co.

Welcome and Introductions

Kelly Davis

Kelly Davis welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced guests and had a short inspiration presentation video, “Kid President, 20 Things You Should say More Often”

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

Discussion Topics

Record Review and Discussion

Kim Johnson and Beth Carter

Kim Johnson and Beth Carter led the discussion and review of the Record Review document that was first presented at the October meeting. The review started at Page 48. Beth Carter indicated that if, while reviewing this document you see something that you aren't doing now, that, unless it is extremely important, like indicator 11 or items that have to be reported at the end of the year, that you might want to consider changing at the beginning of next year after meeting with district and staff rather than changing midstream.

Page 48 – 3 items have been added under Item 62

- **If the ARC is reevaluating to determine continued eligibility for a previously determined category of disability, there must be evidence of progress data collection and analysis.**
Already in the document but Kim indicated that KDE is really looking at evidence of progress data collection everywhere. Example: #62, the first yes/no: A review and analysis of the referral information (for initial evaluation) OR progress monitoring data of the child (for reevaluation); This is for consent. You have to do the analysis of the progress monitoring for the referral information for the initial evaluation but you also have to do the analysis of the progress monitoring data for the consent of re-evaluation EVERY TIME you get the consent to evaluate. Example Kim was “dinged” because they did not do an analysis of the progress monitoring when they decided to hold an extra meeting to just get the consent to do the re-evaluation. Therefore, they had to do a whole new evaluation because when they got the consent to evaluate they did not do the analysis of the progress monitoring data. **VERY IMPORTANT: EVERYTIME YOU MEET, YOU NEED TO DO THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS MONITORING DATA**
- There is a need for progress monitoring training. Latest update: Denise Bailey had module completed and she has piloted the module. Unfortunately, Denise Bailey has moved on. Kelly made the offer to KDE that the Directors of Special Ed to do whatever needs to be done to finish the task and get the information disseminated. KDE indicated they will let her know.
- Beth also had a recommendation. She had noticed that everyone is doing a good job in monitoring, however, they are not doing the analytical piece – summary to show the progress. Also, whatever you do in your documenting especially in revaluations and evaluations, to label what everything stands for. Example: If you are using monitoring data and anecdotal notes for observations purposes, which you can do, it is not marked as such and therefore, districts are being dinged for not having observation data as it is not clear what you are using for observations.
- **If the ARC is reevaluating to determine eligibility when a student ages out of Developmental Delay, there must be evidence of the collection and analysis of progress data during implementation of research-based instruction and interventions for the identified areas of concern.**

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

- Changing categories - Make sure that you have clear documentation of interventions in the progress monitoring going from one area to the other
- **If the ARC is reevaluating to determine eligibility for another disability category, there must be evidence of the collection and analysis of progress data during implementation of research-based instruction and interventions for the identified areas of concern.**
 - When reevaluating to determine eligibility for another disability category to clearly have interventions and progress monitoring documentation labeled. Kim indicated that she attaches on the front of the folder a cover sheet summarizing the interventions used and the progress monitoring data to make sure it is readily available and very clear and identifiable.

Item 69A:

- **Look for: Consent to Evaluate/Reevaluate, Conference Summary/Action Notice, Review of Records/Reevaluation Summary Form**

For reevaluation purposes, classroom-based observations include:

- a. a combination of at least two forms of current informal teacher observations such as progress monitoring data, anecdotal notes, or documented teacher input about student performance; OR**
- b. at least two formal teacher observations; OR**
- c. a combination of both a and b.**

- Beth pointed out that #a can be counted as an observation in reevaluations. Most districts have been doing formal observations which is fine but you can also use the informal teacher observations or a combination of the informal and formal and be in compliance. Just be sure to document what you are using as observation data.
- The **exception is SLD** – for initial evaluations or reevaluations, you have to do two formal teacher observations.
- **Page 52 - 69a. If the ARC determines additional data is not needed for a reevaluation, the ARC documents the review of existing data**
 - Kim indicated that information has to come from #3 and #4 but she has submitted a clarification question. She indicated that they had used current classroom-based assessment data but was cited for not using local or state assessment data as one of the observations. Her question is that if they are using formative assessment data, does that not fall under #3?
- **A cognitive measure may not be needed if the two previous cognitive evaluations are consistent. If consistency across scores is questionable, consult with your school psychologist.**

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

- **For high school students who do not have a current (within 3 year period) IQ score may need to be reevaluated in order to determine transition needs and services.**
 - This is new information that may impact what you are doing.
 - Beth indicated that she thought this was stemming from transition planning especially for college bound students and the fact that the impression was that you had to test college bound students for accommodations. Beth indicated that you are under no obligation to do that. If they go to college, the school can do that. Vocational Rehab can do it. She indicated that, however, if you are having to go back 10 years for testing for accommodations, that may be too long a period of time to go back and see where they are. Sometimes documentation just showing that you are cognizant of their accommodation needs is enough without having to retest especially if they are using the same accommodations throughout their school career.
 - **Reminder/Clarification:** You cannot use a phone call as a written notice. Legally provide a parent a 7-day notice. If the parent does not show, you cannot meet. If parent wants to meet earlier, fine. Still send out the notice indicating that the parent wants to meet earlier. If parent does not show the second time, you can meet without them and document that the parent had 14 day notice. If you get permission to meet without the parent, you can do so without sending the second notice. Also, you cannot send the two notices overlapping. Regulations state that the notice has to go out at least seven days prior to the ARC meeting. Example, you send out the first notice on Monday to meet the following week and you want to send out another notice two days later. That does not constitute two written notices. Sending out overlapping notices will not align with regulations concerning ARC meetings. It was mentioned that if you meet with the parent before the meeting and they indicate that the ARC meeting can meet without them, you do not have to give two notices and you can meet on the first planned day.

Beth also mentioned that when doing record review, there is a website randomizer.org that when you plug in your information, the tool will randomize the records for you. Do not wait until spring to do those as those records you must be 100% compliant. With Indicator 13 you can fix a lot of things before spring. Some things you can fix on the non-programmatic change form. As long as you don't change the content of the programming for the student.

Transportation

Beth Carter

Beth has received questions on two issues – ELL – this issue will be added to agenda in the near future. The transportation manual is from 2002; Very few regulations are expected to change.

Beth indicated that what is being seen is that students are put on special education students on Specialized transportation whether they need it or not. Some kids could benefit from being on a regular bus. Page 10, Appendix A is a really good resource to determine whether the student needs to be on special transportation.

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

Also, even though the Related Services Manual is for OT/PT/Speech, in the Related Services Manual, Page 23, is the best statement/question for justifying related services. If you modify the question, the question becomes, "Is transportation and the specialized part of transportation needed, is it a necessary component of the student's educational program in order for him or her to achieve identified outcomes". Is special transportation going to benefit them more than being with regular same age peers and there is a specialized piece to this. "Is that really needed for the student?" If you are having issues with transportation for special education students, this document might help resolve these issues.

Included in the meeting folder was the Intensive Needs Checklist. This document deals with providing a personal assistant for student. It is an excellent resource and with modification it can also be used to determine if a special education student needs to be on a specialized bus. Using the checklist would be beneficial as you would be able to inform the parent that you will be gathering data to determine if the student qualifies for special transportation and if you complete checklist, it can be used as backup documentation in determining if the student really needs and should receive specialized transportation.

The question was asked that if a student receives specialized transportation must either a parent or another adult escort the student on and off the bus. The answer is that only a preschool student has to be escorted on and off the bus.

Beth indicated that as will be looking at CCR for the 1% that we will be seeing more on the instructional piece of transportation for higher functioning students, example, students with autism. Students as early as preschool will engage in social stories on the instruction on bus riding and this will tie into Specially Designed Instruction. This will be a perfect opportunity to teach students how to ride a bus and what the expectations are for that student.

CCR 1%

Barb DeGraaf

The CCR 1% Task group purpose is two-fold:

1. Define and measure CCR for students on the Alt Assessment and development an assessment and accountability model
2. Develop a transition to the Post-secondary model for students with IEPs that remained in school until the age of 21

2012-13 SY – 21 percent of students of Alt Assess obtained level of CCR. This is unacceptable level.

Model will have 2 parts to it.

1. Looking at College ready which will be based on the TAR (Transition Attainment Record), so there is really no change. The students will continue to work on the alternate academic standards (ELA, math, science and social studies) leading up to making benchmarks on the TAR.
2. Biggest change is addition to career ready. This is for students who cannot meet benchmark college ready, they will now have the opportunity to make benchmarks on career ready. This will also have two parts.

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

- Being career ready academic. A new document has been development. It is in the final draft. The ESAR (Employability Skills Attainment Record). It is a check list of skills and knowledge in the area of career awareness and development. It will be used formatively. As they develop and achieve the skills, the ESAR will reflect the change. The scale rating will be from “No Evidence” to “Self Reliant” and as the student progresses, you will be able to see that on the scale. The ESAR is based on EFAS-AA – Employability and Foundational Academic Skills – Alternate Assessment. This is a new document development from pulling information from the KOSSA which is used for all students. The EFAS-AA Progression of Skills (soft skills) that are critical components of worker productivity. So it is, therefore, closely related to being success on the job. The document shows the progression beginning in the primary grades through high school.
- It is noted that not only will students need to benchmark academic but also to benchmark career ready technical which is attainment of a career work experience certificate. This will show that the student has completed a career work experience curriculum. The student will have an opportunity to practice and juggle what they have learned in the classroom in the work and community setting.

Both documents are in the draft state. The holdup for release of the model is because of the CCR model for all students. Until they are sure there won't be any changes to that model, the CCR 1% model will not be released.

A benefit to districts will be that students can be College and Career Ready . If a district has students that benchmark on the TAR and go on to earn the Career Ready, your district can receive bonus points.

The program should be fully adopted in 2016-17. Barb is unsure of when it will go into the accountability model. She will let everyone know when she finds out. Eventually the program will be part of each districts accountability model. Barb provided a document provided to help districts to prepare. It was included in the packet. Barb and Deb plan to begin sharing information with teachers beginning in January. If you have any questions, contact Barb DeGraaf.

TPGES for Special Education

Kathy and Betsy M.

The task group wanted to see how PGES will affect special education teachers. When reviewing PGES for Special Education Teachers, the task group has found that the CEC Standards are aligning very nicely with the four domains in PGES until you get to the components in the elements. The task group has been digging deeply into the CEC Standards. Many of the CEC Standards fell in several of the four domains so then they looked at the sources of evidence. The group came up with a guidance document that aligns the CEC standards into the four domains. Then the group included the elements of components of what this would look like for special education teachers including artifacts(what artifacts can the teacher show) and then listed some guidance questions and resources, so principals or instructional leaders will know what kind of conversation to have with special education teachers and they will understand what they are doing. The task force is still meeting and working on it. It has not been formally approved or rolled out to date. It will be presented at CEC next week but it can be shared but be aware there could be minor changes to the document.

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

Kathy indicated that the document will be adapted for Low Incidence Teachers, PASS Coaches and EBD Teachers as well. The forms are in CKEC website at the following link,
<https://www.livebinders.com/play/play?present=true&id=1310767>

Bill Porter stated that the ELLEN Trainings are addressing the TPGES for Special Education Teachers issues for Preschool Teachers.

Other Discussion

Kelly Davis

- **Test Protocol Usage in Small Districts** – Kelly asked if anyone had any suggestions for smaller districts not being able to use one packet of protocols for the new Woodcock Johnson or the WISC. It was asked if GRREC could purchase and sell to districts but Kelly indicated that probably would not be legal. Although there are only 25 protocols in one packet and they should be good for at least eight years, smaller districts may not be able to use that many. Suggestion was made to purchase from a neighboring district. If you have any other suggestions, let Kelly know.
- **IC IEP Addendum – has the “fix” helped at all.** Discussion indicated that some issues have been corrected but other issues have not. Specifically, the addendum issue is not fixed. There are any clear suggestions to resolve the addendum issue. Suggestion by Infinite Campus was that if your child count is not correct, to send it in pencil/paper count. Kelly was informed that funding due to this Infinite Campus issue would not be negatively impacted if your child count is not correct. Kelly asked for that in writing but hasn’t received anything as of yet. Kelly was also told that districts would not be “dinged” for having to make changes in Infinite Campus. She asked for it in writing.
- **Visible Learning** – the group participated in a learned activity regarding the visible learning. Kelly asked for feedback whether or not the group finds this kind of activity helpful to have occasionally. Email Kelly if you do have any feedback on this activity.

Hot Topics

Spelling Bee

Meena Mann

The Spelling Bee will be held on Dec 4. 30 students are expected from Bowling Green and other areas. The first and second place winners will receive a certificate and a trophy. If you know of any students that might want to participate, please email Meena and she will forward the information.

Retirement Celebration

The group celebrated Beth Carter’s retirement after 39 years in the field of education. Congratulations Beth.

Reminder of CEC

Michelle Antle reminded everyone of the upcoming CEC Conference in Louisville, November 23, 24 & 25, 2014.

GRREC SPECIAL EDUCATION

Notes by Rebecca Gaddie:

January and February Small Group Meetings Sign-Ups -

Please share ideas for small group time with Skip on EL topics for the March Meeting

SLP Network -

Beth Shared:

Kaitlyn has come on and has a communications disorder certification. She can facilitate a communication network to support Speech Paths. We suggest identifying one or two (depending on size of district) leaders that could attend the network meeting and return to district to share information with rest of district. Please submit 1 or 2 names of people you would like added to that distribution list to Kaitlyn King. Kaitlyn will watch for trainings that might be of interest to the group.

Notes by Kelly Davis:

Kelly shared: GRREC was awarded an I-3 Grant (4-year) grant that supports high schools with CCR specifically concerning SWD. Districts were chosen based on the criteria of the grant. 9 high schools (Muhlenburg, Webster, get the rest from Kelly) are part of the grant. The high schools will receive intensive training from a CCR coach within their building. GRREC, as a whole, can learn from the schools that are participating in the grant as well as possibly having access to some trainings that are part of the grant.

Beth Shared: Resources: www.understood.org is a parent website that has a feature called “through your child’s eyes” that allows others to experience what children/students with disabilities or learning difficulties experience

KIMRC – Paula Penrod

Guest Paula Penrod from the Kentucky Instructional Materials Resource Center (KIMRC)
KIMRC is part of Outreach services at KSB and is funded by the federal government to provide the loaning of devices and materials for students who are visually impaired.

Light Touch and SMART Braille are available for a loan period of up to 2 years for new braille users.

When completing a Registration and Eye Report for Children with Visual Problems, please make sure the person completing the form completes all sections. The KIMRC routinely receives forms that are filled out incorrectly and it delays their ability to serve students with visual needs.

If a student with visual impairment transfers into your district and does not have an Eye Report, contact Paula; she may have a copy on file and will be happy to send it to you.

All districts should complete the 2015 Federal Quota Registration. Paula will send out in December and the form can be returned to her any time after January 1.

Any item that needs to be shipped to the KIMRC can be shipped for free. All you have to do is write “Free Matter for the Blind” on the box.